REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Paragraph [0033] of the specification is amended to overcome the examiner's objection.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 12-20 are amended with the support of paragraphs [0034] and [0038] of the specification. No new matter is introduced. In addition, claims 3 and 9 are cancelled without prejudice.

35 USC 112

Per paragraph 4-1 of the Action, claim 2 has been amended to clarify that "said execution time" is referred to the execution time of each individual simulating element.

Per paragraph 4-2 of the Action, the simulated hardware has been defined in amended claim 2 so as to overcome the examiner's rejection of claims 5-7.

Per paragraph 4-3 of the Action, the limitation "the operation of said simulating elements" in claim 13 has been amended into --execution of said simulating elements-- so as to overcome the examiner's rejection.

Per paragraph 4-4 of the Action, the limitation "the simulated hardware" in claim 14 has been amended into --a simulated hardware -- so as to overcome the examiner's rejection.

Per paragraph 4-5 of the Action, claims 15-16 have been amended to dependent from claim 12 instead of claim 4 so as to overcome the examiner's rejection.

Per paragraph 4-6 of the Action, the limitation "the simulated hardware" in claims 15-16 has been amended into --a simulated hardware -- so as to overcome the examiner's rejection.

Per paragraph 4-7 of the Action, the limitation "the operation of said simulating elements" in claim 19 has been amended into --execution of said simulating elements-- so as to overcome the examiner's rejection.

35 USC 102 & 103

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

First of all, the combined prior art references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. For example, Elias in view of Hellestrand fails to disclose or suggest that an interval between a pair of said specified or expected time points is independently adjustable so as to optionally change simulating speeds of said hardware-simulating program in different portions of said predetermined sequence.

Furthermore, there is no reasonable expectation of success from the combined prior art references. According to the present invention, the simulating speeds of said hardware-simulating program can be optionally changed in different portions of said predetermined sequence. This is particularly useful for observing the desired portion clearly at a low speed, while skipping the less important portion quickly at a high speed to reduce verifying time. This object cannot be achieved by the combined prior art references.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all currently pending claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-20 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas M. Hardman/

Thomas M. Hardman
Reg. No. 51,777
Attorney for Applicant

Date: February 5, 2007

MADSON & AUSTIN
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700